

Remarks:

After entry of this amendment, claims 1-8 are pending in the subject application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4, and 5 in order to further define and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections cited in the Office Action dated March 4, 2003.

The Examiner noted that no copy of U.K. Patent No. 1,367 of 1871 was provided, though that patent was listed on the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 5, 2002. Applicant has enclosed a legible copy of that patent in response thereto.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they did not include the following reference sign mentioned in the description: first surface **28** (page 6). Applicant has enclosed a corrected drawing showing first surface 28 on Figure 1. The Examiner also objected to the drawings of Figure 14 as requiring a bracket. A corrected drawing of Figure 14 is enclosed in response thereto.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,357,462 to Laosunthara, et al. With respect to claims 1-5, applicant has amended claim 1 to limit the claims to the structure. With respect to claims 6 and 7, applicant notes that while Laosunthara, et al. discloses both a flexible covering surrounding a frame **12** and a flexible covering removably attached to a frame **30**, it discloses these as separate elements, not as a single flexible covering as described in claim 6. Similarly, with respect to claim 8, Laosunthara, et al.

discloses a flexible covering element bearing a second visible pattern 30 and also discloses a flexible covering element adapted to surround and cover panel elements 40. Claim 8 is distinct from Laosunthara, et al. by claiming these characteristics in a single, flexible covering element. With these amendments and explanations, Applicant believes that he has successfully traversed Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).


The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nichols, U.S. Pat. No. 4,709,718. With respect to claims 1 and 3-5, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further limit the claimed structure. With respect to claims 6 and 7, Applicant notes that Nichols does not disclose the elements from claim 6 in a description of a portable enclosure. With respect to claim 8, Nichols does not disclose panel elements connected together to form a perimeter of an enclosure. With these amendments and explanations, Applicant believes that he has successfully traversed the Examiner's rejections of claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based upon Nichols.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones, U.S. Pat. No. 6,010,176. With respect to claims 1-5, Applicant has amended the claims to more specifically describe the claimed structure. With respect to claims 6 and 7, Jones does not disclose the use of a collapsible frame. With these amendments and explanations, Applicant suggests that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Jones.

For the foregoing reasons and in light of the amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections to the above-noted claims and allow the claims to proceed to issue.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this matter, Applicant's attorney may be reached at (734) 662-0270.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end, positioned above a horizontal line.

DATED: July 3, 2003

Marshall G. MacFarlane, Reg. No. 27,296